

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,306	05/24/2000	Bastiaan Hendrik Bakker	F3238(C)	4727
201 7.	590 08/10/2006		EXAMINER	
	NTELLECTUAL PROI	SORKIN, DAVID L		
700 SYLVAN			T I DOWN THE T	D. DOD
BLDG C2 SOUTH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100			1723	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/577,306	BAKKER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David L. Sorkin	1723			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress		
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. ely filed the mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice of th	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is		
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 5,6,13-15,20 and 24 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are without 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 5, 6, 15, 20 and 24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examinet 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the content of the	drawn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Berawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 Cl			
	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite	D-152)		

Art Unit: 1723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 5, 6, 15, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rauwendaal (US 5,932,159) in view of Fels et al. (US 5,345,781). Regarding claim 20, Rauwendaal ('159) discloses a single screw extruder (see col. 7, lines 20-26) comprising an extruding screw (28) and a barrel (18) characterized by from 3 to 4 thread starts (see col. 7, lines 20-26). A pitch range (30-90 degrees) which overlaps the claimed range is disclosed (see col. 10, lines 60-64). In cases where claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art a prima facia case of obviousness exists" (In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). It is further noted that according to the instant specification, the claimed range of 32-42 degrees is not critical, but merely "preferable". Rauwendaal ('159) does not disclose a cooling circuit comprising liquid ammonia. Fels ('781) teaches providing a screw extruder with a cooling circuit comprising ammonia (see col. 3, lines 45-47; col. 11, lines 10-17). It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the extruder of Rauwendaal ('159) with a cooling circuit comprising liquid ammonia because Rauwendaal ('159) states "mixing should be done at as low a temperature as possible" (col. 2, lines 9-10)

Application/Control Number: 09/577,306

Art Unit: 1723

and Fels ('781) teaches that a liquid ammonia cooling circuit provides an extruder with such conditions (see col. 3, lines 45-47; col. 11, lines 10-17). Furthermore, both 'references discuss extruding similar foods with the extruders. For example, both references discuss fruit slurries. See col. 4 lines 52-59 of Fels ('781) and col. 14, lines 44-45 of Rauwendaal ('159). Regarding claims 5 and 15, Rauwendaal ('159) discloses a length to diameter ratio which overlaps the claimed ranges (see col. 10, lines 60-65). Regarding claim 6, channel width and height are recognized a variable to be optimized according to equations provided (see col. 10, lines 1-16). It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have optimized these variables according to the equations provided. As held in *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233, "where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation". Regarding claim 24, "the manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself" *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant correctly points of that the specification need not disclose values as critical for applicants to present evidence showing the values are critical. However, firstly, the specification goes beyond just not stating that the now-claimed values are critical, to actual state on page 4, lines 6-9 that it is an "object of the present invention to provide an extruder" having values other than those that applicant now argue are critical. Secondly, applicant has not provided any evidence other than what is in the specification.

Application/Control Number: 09/577,306

Art Unit: 1723

4. Applicant states that "the ice cream temperature at 35-40 degrees is a good 1 degree below the temperature achieved for smaller pitch angles". However, smaller pitch angles are within the scope of the claims, and applicant explains that there is a substantial margin of error in measuring the temperature. Furthermore, 19 degrees pitch angle yield and 40 degree pitch angle are both capable of providing the same temperature of –12 degrees according the data in the specification.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L. Sorkin whose telephone number is 571-272-1148. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 -5:30 Mon.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David L. Sorkin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

DLS